COMPLETED 64

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1984 on the Land and Water Conservation Fund Grants-in-Aid program was prepared in accordance with Section 6(f)(7) of the Land & Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. As required in the Act, it was transmitted to the Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, and to the Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives on April 8, 1985.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Introduction	1
L&WCF Program Accomplishments	2
Fiscal Year 1984 Program	2
Completion of FY 1983 Jobs Act Grants	3
Highlights of Grant Program During FY 1984	4
Alaska Region Summary	11
Pacific Northwest Region Summary	15
Western Region Summary	17
Southwest Region Summary	21
Rocky Mountain Region Summary	27
Midwest Region Summary	31
Southeast Region Summary	35
Mid-Atlantic Region Summary	37
State Concerns	43
Appendix	47

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

This report is submitted to Congress in compliance with Section 6(f)(7) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) Act, as amended. Section 6(f)(7) requires that each State evaluate its L&WCF grant program annually under guidelines set forth by the Secretary of the Interior and transmit such evaluation to the Secretary, together with a list of all projects funded during the fiscal year, including but not limited to a description of each project, the source of other funds, and the estimated cost of completing the project. The results of such evaluations are to be reported annually to the National Park Service (NPS) on a fiscal year basis. The service, in turn, prepares a summary report to Congress. State reports must include an analysis of the accomplishments of the fund for the reporting periods and may also include suggestions for future improvements for operating the fund program.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was enacted ". . . to assist in preserving, developing and assuring accessiblity to all citizens of the United States of America of present and future generations. . . such quality and quantity of outdoor recreation resources as may be available and are necessary and desirable for individual active participation. . . ." The fund program provides matching grants to States, and through the States to local units of government, for the acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Planning grants are also available to the States to help develop Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans (SCORP).

At the Federal level, the fund program is administered by NPS through eight Regional Offices. The Service's Washington office provides guidance and program coordination. Project proposals are submitted to NPS Regional Offices through the State agency or individual (State Liaison Officer) authorized to represent the State for purposes of administering the L&WCF Act. The States are responsible for analyzing needs, determining priorities for funding projects, supervising projects, and ensuring program compliance with Federal regulations and administrative guidelines affecting the program.

This annual report has been designed to summarize the overall effectiveness of the States in meeting the objectives of their respective State Plans and the L&WCF. In this summary report, reports from each National Park Service Region highlight the major State priorities and projects during the year. In addition, certain overall program statistics are noted, as are significant developments in State planning efforts and State suggestions for future improvements in the program.

More detailed information on individual State's activities is available through NPS or the appropriate State Liaison Officer. A complete listing of all L&WCF projects approved by NPS during FY 1984 is available upon request.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

L&WCF PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Funding History Through Fiscal Year 1984

Since the origin of the L&WCF in 1965, almost $2.9 billion have been appropriated to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and the Northern Marianas for planning, acquisition, and development grants designed to improve the quantity and quality of outdoor recreation opportunities in the United States. The income for the L&WCF is provided largely from Outer Continental Shelf mineral receipts, with additional income through the sale of Federal surplus property. Table 1 (see Appendix) shows appropriations for the Fund from 1965 through 1985.

Through FY 1984, a total of 31,777 projects have been approved to support the acquisition of open space for parklands or the development of outdoor recreation facilities. Federal obligations totalling $2,870,176,518 have been matched by State and local contributions, for a total investment of almost $6 billion. Of the total number of projects, 7,903 projects have been for the acquisition of over 2,786,172 acres of park land while 23,485 projects have been for the development of outdoor recreational facilities. Sixty-three percent of the total funds obligated have gone to locally sponsored projects to provide close-to-home recreational opportunities that are readily accessible to user populations. Table 2 (see Appendix) shows obligations by State over the life of the program.

Since 1965, funding for the required Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning (SCORP) process has totalled 389 projects with a Federal share of $38,503,616. SCORPs provide long-term policy guidance (Assessment and Policy Plans) and detailed Action Programs to guide public and private outdoor recreation programs within each State over the next several years.

FISCAL YEAR 1984 PROGRAM

The primary purposes of the State Grants portion of the L&WCF are:

1) to assist the States in the development and maintenance of the SCORP and,

2) to provide grants-in-aid to States and local units of government for acquisition of park lands and open space and development of facilities for outdoor recreation.

Funding Assistance

The amount of grants obligated by the States in FY 1984 was $107.4 million.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A summary of FY 1984 grant obligations follows:

- Federal obligations were $107,437,077, an increase of $81 million over FY 1982 and an increase of $13 million over FY 1983.

- Standard Metroplitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) received 51.1 percent of grant funds (see Appendix, Table, 3, for State-by-State breakdown of SMSA funding).

- Cities with population of 40,000 or over received 15.5 percent of grant funds.

- Total number of grants was 1,484. Grants by type were:

  - 278 acquisition grants to acquire 64,461 acres of park and recreation land.

  - 1,182 development grants to provide support facilities (walkways, lighting, comfort stations, etc.), sports and playfields, picnic areas and other basic recreation facilities.

  - 24 planning grants to support ongoing improvements in Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans and planning programs.

- Local-government-sponsored projects received 63 percent of the total funds obligated.

- State-government-sponsored projects received 37 percent of the total funds obligated.

- Acquisition projects received 31.4 percent of the funds obligated, development projects received 66 percent of the funds obligated and planning projects received 2.6 percent of the funds obligated.

COMPLETION OF FY 1983 JOBS ACT GRANTS

Under the authority of the Emergency Jobs Act of 1983, Public Law 98-8, $40,000,000 were obligated by September 9, 1983, for construction projects that would create employment opportunities. All grants were scheduled for completion by September 30, 1984.

At the end of fiscal 1984, 95% of all Jobs Act projects were complete, with outlays of $37,215,028 on original obligations. In October, Congress extended the final billing deadline to March 1, 1985. All Jobs Act grants were completed as of that date, with additional outlays of $972,485. A total of $1,812,487 in deobligations (due to cost underruns on original estimates) has been returned to the Treasury in accord with the special provisions of Public Law 98-8. A National Park Service analysis of the employment impacts of Jobs Act grants was delayed because of the extension of project completion deadlines, but is expected to be completed by June 1985.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROGRAM DURING FY 1984

Review of Open Project Selection Process

Background - Since FY 1983, each State has been required to have an Open Project Selection Process (OPSP) in place in order to remain eligible to participate in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant-in-Aid Program. The purpose of such selection processes is to ensure that all eligible project sponsors have equal opportunity to participate in and benefit from the L&WCF program and that criteria and procedures for competitive evaluation of projects from State and local agencies adequately reflect the priorities of the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), a legislative prerequisite for participating in the Fund Program.

In recognition of the importance of the OPSP in determining projects selected for funding at the State level, the National Park Service undertook a review of several State OPSP procedures in FY 1984 to assess their effectiveness in selecting projects that were a high SCORP priority. In addition, projects actually selected for funding were reviewed as to their relationship to the SCORP and OPSP; when the information was available, unfunded projects were also reviewed for comparison purposes. Data were also obtained on the procedures used by the States to advise eligible participants of the availability of L&WCF assistance.

Detailed information on OPSP implementation was requested from ten States representing all geographic regions of the country. Some of the data received were incomplete and could not be fully analyzed; however, the material submitted by the States was augmented by information gathered during a series of State and Regional Office reviews undertaken in FY 1984 by NPS staff, during which information on State OPSPs was considered, and, where applicable, incorporated into the findings of the OPSP review.

It should be noted that NPS has been working closely with State program administrators over the last year in addressing some of the issues discussed below. As a result, State OPSP's are continually being revised and updated. Therefore, the findings based on data obtained through mid-1984 may not reflect the status of individual State OPSP's currently in place. A summary of the review follows.

Summary of Findings - One of the major components of each OPSP is a priority rating system or formula that ensures the fair and equitable evaluation of all projects submitted for funding. Each system must also place strong emphasis on the project's conformance with priority needs identified through the SCORP process. The rating systems were reviewed with this objective in mind. With only one exception, all States had rating system(s) in place for both State and locally-sponsored projects. California's rating system only addressed local projects. Eight of ten States utilized separate systems while one (Oklahoma) used the same system for both State and local projects.

Without exception, all rating systems included some reference to State plan (SCORP) priorities, along with other need and performance measures. However, despite some similarities in statistical or mathematical approaches, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

States varied greatly with respect to the importance placed on SCORP-identified needs as a rating criteria. For example, California's system only provides for a yes/no determination as to whether a specific project complies with the SCORP, although its formula addresses generic SCORP concerns such as access, minority populations, and energy efficiency. The system fails to address the degree of compatability with the SCORP and thus makes it impossible to compare (rank) one project against another with respect to SCORP compatibility as required by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

In Alabama's system, the sponsor must document and present evidence from the SCORP that recreation demand exceeds supply. Conformance with the SCORP is not specifically addressed in the Program Criteria section of the rating system, but the protection of natural areas, a high SCORP priority, is included under "Incentive Criteria" implying that it is an additional way to obtain "bonus" points rather than a minimum requirement for assistance (South Carolina's system also included SCORP needs as an incentive criteria).

The rating systems for State projects tend to be less complex by incorporating fewer measured criteria which would not normally apply to a State-wide applicant and include criteria more directly related to the SCORP. The formula used by Minnesota includes all the recreation issues described in Chapter V of its 1979 SCORP. Connecticut also rates its State projects using six "priority classification groups" which are tantamount to SCORP policy areas. Two of the seven criteria for State projects in South Carolina and one of the three criteria for Missouri are SCORP related.

Even though SCORP priority is included as a selection criterion, the points assigned to this criterion are often equal to or less than other rating factors which should be secondary to meeting the priorities in the SCORP. In theory, therefore, an unfunded project could receive more points for meeting a SCORP priority than a funded project which was ranked higher based on other less significant ranking criteria.

States generally did an excellent job of ensuring that all potential applicants are notified in a timely manner of the availability of L&WCF funding and the schedule for project submission. Several States used well prepared and comprehensive handbooks which describe the application process and the State's system for open project selection. Table 5 of the appendix, which shows State-by-State competitive levels of grant requests and awards for each State indicate widespread State and local grantee participation in State selection processes during FY 1984, with the number of requests (4,319) running almost three times higher than the number of applications selected (1,491) for funding. Newsletters, mass mailings, announcements at conferences, press releases, and radio broadcasts are also used. Less clear from the review is the degree to which States made efforts to encourage projects which directly benefit minority populations within the State. Distribution of the rating system criteria which, in most cases, address the low income, the handicapped and/or the elderly, indirectly accomplishes this purpose. However, direct contact with groups such as the statewide minority associations and local Community Action organizations is a preferable alternative (Minnesota, South Carolina).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conclusions - The Open Project Selection Process has resulted in objective published criteria which generally assure fair competition among all proposals for L&WCF funding. Further refinements are necessary to ensure that the State planning processes uniformly filter out proposals which fail to address such critical needs. The review identified several areas which the NPS will need to further consider and clarify for the benefit of program administrators at the State level to ensure the integrity and accountability of the program. These areas include:

- the desirability of establishing prototype project ranking systems which address the problems noted above and can be easily incorporated into existing State systems.

- the need for a clearcut, formal schedule for OPSP updates and revisions in conjunction with SCORP-identified changes in needs and policies.

- NPS clarification of the applicability of OPSP requirements for qualified pro[illegible], resubmittal of withdrawn projects, and project amendments.

- how to accommondate funding of State projects which may require advance approval by State legislatures. Because many legislatures are on biennial schedules, funding of priority State park projects under OPSP requirements could, in some cases, require project selection up to one or two years before L&WCF funds are available.

- the effects on competition of ceilings imposed by some States on the amount of funding available to any one applicant in a given year.

Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning

The L&WCF Act requires that each State maintain a Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) as a condition for participation in the program. The current L&WCF Manual requirements are being revised to provide minimum standards for SCORP planning that are constructive to the L&WCF Act and its legislative history. The NPS goal in revising the guidelines is to have a more uniform nationwide application of requirements within which each State can develop its own unique outdoor recreation planning process.

In order to ensure protection of the $2.9 billion investment in Federal funds made by the L&WCF Program in public outdoor recreation areas and facilities, one of the basic changes being proposed in the revised guidelines is that States must consider management capability as well as new capital and development programs in their planning to ensurs continuing ability to operate and maintain all grant-assisted facilities in accord with Section 6(f)(3) of the L&WCF Act.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Budgetary constraints have led some States to cut back on staffing and other resources for L&WCF planning and grant administration. This made it necessary to grant extensions to some States to allow them time to complete plan updates when they could not meet their initial schedules. At the end of 1984, two States, Mississippi and the Virgin Islands, were ineligible to participate in the L&WCF Program, due to deficiencies in their SCORP processes.

During the year, 13 States submitted updated, five-year assessment and policy plans and 33 States updated their biennial Action Programs. At the end of FY 1984, 33 States and one U.S. Territory had active L&WCF planning grants to assist in maintaining their SCORP Programs. The obligations for these grants totalled $10.9 million, and the unexpended balances totalled $5.4 million.

Of the 33 States with active planning grants, 17 of them received new grants during FY 1984. As of that date, cumulative obligations for L&WCF planning grants since the inception of the program in 1965 totalled $38.5 million.

In April 1984, the third national meeting of State outdoor recreation planners (NASRP) was held in Atlanta, Georgia. More than 30 States were represented at this meeting.

Compliance with Section 6(f)(3) Conversion Requirements of the L&WCF Act

Section 6(f)(3) of the Act specifically mandates that no lands acquired or developed with Fund assistance may be converted to other than public outdoor recreation purposes without permission of the Secretary of the Interior and provision of suitable replacement property.

This section forms the basis for the NPS's continuing compliance responsibility to ensure that park and recreation areas acquired, developed and set aside under the Act remain as permanent additions to the national outdoor recreation estate. Protecting the legacy of over 31,000 projects and twenty years of Federal/State cooperation is one of the highest priorities of program administrators at both the State and Federal levels.

Funding reductions have affected levels of project compliance and monitoring activities at both the State and Federal levels. To ensure that public recreation opportunities continue into the future as envisioned by the first Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and the L&WCF legislation, the Service is continuing its efforts to increase public awareness of the statutory protection afforded all properties acquired or developed with Fund assistance.

The keystone of this effort is an effective early warning system which reduces the number of inadvertent losses of recreation land protected under Section 6(f)(3). A prototype "Section 6(f) Register" developed by the State of Idaho under the auspices of NPS was completed in 1984 and consists of a county-by-county project register and location guide for each L&WCF project within the State.

The effectiveness of this effort in preventing the conversion of protected park and recreation areas can only be judged over time; its ultimate success depends on widespread distribution and utilization of the registry. With this

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in mind, the State of Idaho is placing copies of the registry in all college and university libraries and in the State library. Regional summaries are being sent to each of Idaho's Economic Development Associations and Travel Councils; county summaries to each Board of County Commissioners and County Park Board; community summaries to local schools, incumbent mayors and mayors-elect, city councils, park boards, city libraries and the local media; and State agency summaries to each of the State agencies. The availability of this information will be announced by a Statewide press release.

In addition to the Idaho Registry, efforts were directed toward increasing positive cooperation with other Federal agencies having jurisdiction over projects affecting land use. Such advanced coordination helps to prevent unecessary conversion conflicts. Because of the widespread impact of Federal-aid highway construction, the Federal Highway Administration's Division Administrators in each State have been sent current computerized lists of all L&WCF projects within that State along with the name, address and phone number of the appropriate State official for additional information as needed. Updates to this listing will be forwarded periodically. Early coordination among highway officials, L&WCF recipients, the State, and the NPS is a key to identifying affected L&WCF project areas in a timely manner.

Although these and other efforts should continue, there are other issues which need to be reviewed in greater detail, both individually and as a part of a more in-depth evaluation of the NPS's long term compliance responsibilities. In response to this need, in late 1984, the Service created a working group consisting of Washington and Regional Office staff to review and analyze statutory compliance provisions; identify administrative responsibilities at the local, State and Federal levels; and to review all options available to ensure continued compliance with the statutory requirements. Initial findings of the work group will be completed in 1985.

State Obligation and Expenditure Rates

L&WCF program administration has continued to place great importance on having the States fully utilize all funds available to them. As of September 30, 1984, significant progress was made by the States in reducing their unexpended balances during the fiscal year. State obligation for FY 1984 were $107 million, leaving an end-of-year balance of $14.9 million (see Table 4 of the appendix). The overall unexpended balance (unobligated funds plus obligated but not outlayed funds) went from $439 million to $268 million at the end of FY 1984. This outlay performance of $171 million consisted of $134 million in regular apportionments and $37 million in Job Act funds (see Table 4 of the appendix).

In accordance with Section 6 of the L&WCF Act, forty percent of the FY 1985 apportionment was divided equally among the States, and sixty percent was apportioned to the States on the basis of need. Of the sixty percent, twenty-five percent was apportioned on the basis of total population within the States, and twenty percent on the basis of those residing within standard metropolitan areas in the States. The remaining fifteen percent of the fund was apportioned on the basis of population among those States which demonstrated need by the efficient utilization of prior L&WCF apportionments.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This factor was used out of concern for the amount of monies that had been appropriated by Congress in previous years, obligated for projects by the States, but not yet expended. Effective management of the fund requires that, after projects have been approved and monies obligated, those funds be expended to acquire outdoor recreation areas and/or build recreation facilities expeditiously. Those States using L&WCF funds promptly and efficiently were viewed as having a greater need. Therefore, 41 States with good fund utilization rates were included in the apportionment of this fifteen percent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BLANK PAGE

ALASKA REGION SUMMARY

During fiscal year 1984, the State of Alaska received $448,697 in assistance for three new projects. Of the total new projects, one was state-sponsored and 2 involved local units of government. An additional $39,162 was utilized for an amendment to an existing project. Two of these projects were for the development of community recreation areas. The other project was for the development of a State camping area with necessary support facilities.

The State again utilized the Open Project Selection Process (OPSP) to assure all eligible participants statewide an opportunity to submit proposals for funding. Under this process, project information was collected to ascertain relevance to the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), to determine whether the projects had potential to meet the recreational needs of the communities involved and to meet the recreational needs of the State. Seven projects have been selected by using the OPSP to utilize the available FY 1984 funds. In addition, fifteen projects totaling $1,671,080 were evaluated, but could not be funded due to lack of money.

SCORP ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The many actions affecting recreational opportunities in 1984 are described under three major categories: statewide and regional planning, legislation and park acquisition and development projects.

Statewide and Regional Planning

The State of Alaska has integrated outdoor recreation planning with other natural resources planning, a process which requires extensive conflict-resolution. This procedure produces a product with a broader base of support which has a greater chance of implementation than single-resource plans.

As a part of that planning procedure, statewide outdoor recreation goals were refined to achieve consistency between Department of Natural Resources (DNR) multiple resource plans and Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation (DPOR) plans. These revised goals, set forth in the introduction of the 1985 Alaska Outdoor Recreation Action Plan (South Central Region), will be a foundation for the next statewide recreation resource assessment and policy plan, and the recreation element of the 1985 Statewide Natural Resources Plan.

An analysis of the many critical issues confronting outdoor recreation opportunities has resulted in the evolution of the issue statements contained not only in the 1981 Alaska Outdoor Recreation Plan, but the various area plans of the Department of Natural Resources. Shortages of public land within and adjacent to population centers, the need for opportunities for constructive use of leisure time in Alaska's villages and the importance of preserving Alaska's heritage for future generations continue as high priority concerns. Adding new dimensions to previously identified issues, are the importance of recreation in the Alaska economy and the need to meet high expectations for recreation in the face of declining oil revenues.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Land management policies have been developed which address the custodial issues associated with public access, trails, stream corridors, lakeshores, wetlands, and cultural resources. Implementation of these policies will result in the retention of areas critical for outdoor recreation and resource protection in public ownership and will avoid encroachment upon those public recreation experiences.

Agency drafts of the recreation element of regional plans were completed for the Susitna Basin (Southeast Region), Tanana Basin (Interior Region), and Bristol Bay (Southwest Region). As part of the planning process, extensive deliberations were held with planning teams versed in the settlement, agricultural, mining, forestry, wildlife habitat, and recreational aspects of land management and resulted in draft plans which recommended allocations of lands for specific types of use.

Following public meetings, conducted in more than 40 communities, these draft plans were revised to incorporate public concerns and are expected to be approved by the Commissioner of Natural Resources in early 1985.

The Bristol Bay Area Plan, approved by the State of Alaska in 1984, was developed as part of the Bristol Bay Cooperative Management Plan mandated by the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. The reluctance of the State to be subject to federal concurrence on State land use actions, coupled with only limited opportunity for the State to influence federal land use decisions under the constraints imposed by wildlife refuge regulations, resulted in an impasse. The Alaska Land Use Council, representing State and Federal agencies, has agreed to an alternative approach under which the Department of the Interior will complete a Bristol Bay Regional Management Plan pertaining to federal lands, and will develop a Memorandum of Understanding between the State and Interior Department providing for cooperative actions.

The 1981 Alaska Outdoor Recreation Plan and its supporting data, such as the Alaska Public Survey, have been used by consultants when preparing feasibility studies for the Susitna Hydroelectric Project, encouraging tourism in the Matanuska Valley, developing ski areas in Fairbanks and writing master plans for State Park System units such as Caines Head State Recreation Area.

Legislation

Bills approved by the legislature in 1984 resulted in the establishment of Shuyak Island State Park, 11,000 acres of forested hillsides and intricate coastline near Kodiak Island, and the Kenai River Special Management Area, encompassing 98 miles of river plus lakes which possess Alaska's most popular salmon fishery.

Shuyak Island State Park removes the threat of land uses which would detract from the scenic and habitat values which make this island such a high quality setting for boating, hunting, and camping. The Kenai River bill provides for the preparation of a management plan to resolve complex resource conflicts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Park Acquisition and Development

In addition to the allocation of $448,697 of Land and Water Conservation Fund assistance, approximately $35 million was appropriated by the State legislature for local recreation projects which, combined with similar funding in previous years, is resulting in significant increases of recreational opportunities. Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation staff have drafted legislation for a State grants-in-aid and technical assistance program which would entail a more objective allocation process based on needs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BLANK PAGE

PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION SUMMARY

The Pacific Northwest Region includes the States of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. During fiscal year 1984, these States received $3,950,427 in assistance for 70 new projects. Of the total new projects, 8 were state-sponsored and 62 involved local units of government. An additional $126,117 was utilized for amendments to 18 existing projects.

During the year, projects totalling $1,697,985 in assistance were approved for the acquisition of 857 acres of land for open space and recreation; a total of $2,111,192 in assistance was used for new development or rehabilitation of existing facilities; and $141,250 in assistance was approved for planning projects. The types of facilities constructed included 53 projects with support facilities (landscaping, utilities, walkways, comfort stations, etc.), 37 projects with sports and playfields (baseball, tennis courts, playgrounds, etc.), 32 projects with picnic areas (family site, group shelter and 17 projects with trails (hiking, biking, exercise, etc.); most projects involved multiple facilities.

Substantial progress by all three States has been made in reducing unexpended balances during FY 1984. In addition to closing 30 Jobs Bill projects, final billings were processed for many older projects during this fiscal year. The billing activity for active projects continues to improve as the States submit timely interim billings. The States have also been responsive to concerns about overdue inspections and this has positively affected other aspects of the L&WCF program as the States continue to work toward more efficient administration of the program. All three States received additional apportionment amounts as a result of meeting or approximating their target figures for fiscal year 1984.

Washington was granted an extension on the due date for the Sixth Edition of its Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) from November 1984 to June 1985. Work on the forthcoming SCORP included completion of drafts of five of the eight issue papers, plus completion of the chapter on needs. Draft writing was begun on the remaining three issue papers. A SCORP Technical Review Committee was established in November 1984 to begin review and comment on draft elements of the new SCORP.

Additional planning efforts during the year included completion of the six-year statewide capital improvement programs for local governments. State planning staff continued to work with local agencies on their comprehensive park and recreation plans. In addition, map separates and site overlays for the Washington State Recreation Guide were completed and directory information was transcribed and keyed to the maps. These maps will be available for sale in early 1985. The Final Report and Executive Summary of the Governor's Recreation Resource Advisory Committee were completed and published. Staff continued to work with the Pacific Northwest Regional Recreation Committee to develop a new demand/needs data program.

Oregon published its new 5-year Assessment/Policy Plan and an updated Action Program in 1984. In addition, the State received two L&WCF planning grants totalling $55,000.00, in Federal funds during the year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Planning elements to be completed under these grants include standards and classifications, a demand survey, a visitor use survey in State parks, an assessment of the recreational use of water, an update of the State's outdoor recreation action program, a reassessment of recreation issues, and a natural areas assessment in State parks. The visitor survey is 85% complete and work was begun on the demand survey and user assessment. Other elements of the planning projects are on schedule.

Idaho's new 5-year Assessment/Policy Plan and an updated Outdoor Recreation Action Program were approved and published during the year.

In addition, Idaho received a one-year L&WCF planning grant totalling $86,250.00 in 1984, to assist in sustaining a continuing recreation planning program, including improvements in its current SCORP data base.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WESTERN REGION SUMMARY

The Western Region includes the States of Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, the Territories of American Samoa and Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. During fiscal year 1984, these States received $8,817,431 in assistance for 90 new projects. Of the total new projects, 20 were state-sponsored and 70 involved local units of government.

During the year, projects totalling $2,193,850 in assistance were approved for the acquisition of 1,830 acres of land for open space and recreation; a total of $6,447,923 in assistance was used for new development or rehabilitation of existing facilities; and $175,658 in assistance was approved for planning projects. The types of facilities constructed included 78 projects with support facilities (landscaping, parking, lighting, etc.); 47 projects with sports and playfields (baseball fields, tennis courts, playgrounds, etc.); 34 projects with picnic areas; 10 projects with trails (hiking, biking, exercise, etc.); and 14 projects with natural areas; most projects involved multiple facilities.

The clear majority of the projects was for development or rehabilitation. Of 90 new projects submitted, 75 were for development or rehabilitation, 11 for acquisition, 2 combination (development and acquisition), and 2 for planning. In terms of numbers, urban and rural projects were almost equal: 44 urban and 46 rural. This is a switch from the past, where urban projects normally dominate.

The number of project applications received by the States and the amounts requested and funded are illustrated in the following table:

State	Number of Projects Received by States and Total Fed. Assistance Requested		Number of Projects Funded by NPS and Federal Amount	
Arizona	48	$ 3,626,154.00	16	$ 1,099,940.00
California	136	17,358,894.00	51	6,620,264.50
Hawaii	2	463,840.00	2	463,840.00
Nevada	37	2,660,196.50	15	705,250.98
Amer.Samoa	3	52,720.00	3	52,720.00
Guam	1	26,214.00	1	26,214.00
No. Marianas	1	4,073.00	1	4,073.00
TOTALS	228	$24,192,091.50	89	$ 8,972,302.48

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

During the year, 43 Jobs Bill projects were completed by the September deadline. The Federal expenditures for these projects totalled $4,151,664.

A new entity, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands was added to the Region during the year. The Northern Marianas are located north of Guam in the western Pacific Ocean. Due to its small size, the Marianas received an apportionment of only $4,073 for fiscal year 1984.

The State of California is making good progress towards increasing project completion and expenditure rates, in response to concerns about the slowness of program outlays in earlier years. Progress during fiscal year 1984 can be illustrated as follows:

	Active Projects	Unexpended Balance
September 30, 1983	229	$28,673,008
September 30, 1984	169	$15,355,934

During the fiscal year, 60 projects were completed, representing more than 25 percent of 229 projects active at the beginning of the year. During this same period, the unexpended balance of funds was reduced by $13,317,074, or 46 percent.

For several year now, California has imposed stricter deadlines on L&WCF program participants for both the initiation and completion of projects. The results of this policy are beginning to show in the completion rates, and should continue to do so.

The Territory of Guam has had a high percentage of unexpended funds, although the actual dollar amount is very low when compared to the 50 States. Guam is making good progress towards reducing the unexpended balance. During the year, Guam closed out three projects. This seems like a small number, but this indicates excellent progress considering that Guam has had only 18 projects during the entire life of the L&WCF program.

Other States in the Western Region completed projects and expenditures in a timely manner, thus meeting projected targets.

In the SCORP program, there were two new planning grants awarded in the Western Region. The State of California received a planning grant of $171,585.50 to include an action program report, policy plan update, State park system plan update, and special studies. The new Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands submitted its first grant application ($4,073) for the development of an outdoor recreation plan.

During the fiscal year 1984, the most significant planning accomplishment by Arizona was the publishing and distribution of the State's new SCORP. Both the text and portions of the technical document were printed and distributed to approximately 1,000 entities. In addition, an action program was developed and adopted in February, 1984, which runs through February 1986.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In August 1984, the administration of the L&WCF program was transferred from the Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission (AORCC) to Arizona State Parks. However, AORCC retains the authority to award L&WCF grants and approve Arizona's SCORP.

Arizona's open project selection process continues to be closely coordinated with the SCORP through the Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission Guidelines and Priority Rating System. In addition to the SCORP priorities which are reflected in both the guidelines and rating system, the results of needs assessment workshops are directly incorporated into the rating system under the evaluation criteria of statewide and county needs.

In California, the process for evaluating and selecting grant projects is key to the successful administration of the L&WCF program. The open project selection process and the SCORP are two integral parts to the process.

California continues to maintain an active SCORP program. The following are among the special studies completed this past year as a part of the State's SCORP: The Recreation and Leisure Industry's Contribution to California Economy; Revenue-Generating Strategies for Park and Recreation Agencies; and Stewardship - 1983, Managing the Natural and Scenic Resources of the California State Park System.

During fiscal year 1984, the State of Hawaii submitted an updated Action Program, which runs through April, 1986. The SCORP and the OPSP are used in setting L&WCF project priorities, and the SCORP is used as a guide for the biennial budget for State recreation projects.

The State of Nevada's open project selection process has not changed since it was approved in 1981. The system has been in use in nearly the same format for over 15 years.

During the fiscal year 1984, Nevada continued to work on the State's systems plan SCORP grant. Workshops were held on the SCORP planning process in each of Nevada's park planning districts, and a visitor survey of State park users was conducted.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BLANK PAGE

SOUTHWEST REGION SUMMARY

The Southwest Region includes the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas. During fiscal year 1984, these States received a total of $8,406,804 in assistance for 153 new projects. Of the total new projects, 12 were state-sponsored and 141 involved local units of government.

During the year, projects totalling $2,656,319 in assistance were approved for the acquisition of 626 acres of land for open space and recreation; a total of $5,700,485 in assistance was used for new development or rehabilitation of existing facilities; and $50,000 in assistance was approved for planning projects. Types of facilities constructed included 136 projects with support facilities (landscaping, utilities, comfort stations, etc.), 106 projects with sports and playfields (baseball, tennis courts, playgrounds, etc.), 54 projects with picnic areas, and 30 projects with trails (hiking, biking, exercise, etc.); most projects involved multiple facilities.

In the State of Arkansas, $958,739 was obligated to 36 new projects, which included $237,282 for the acquisition of 87 acres and $721,457 for development of recreation facilities. Thirty-four projects were sponsored by local units of government, while the Department of Parks and Tourism and the Game and Fish Commission sponsored two projects totalling $153,688.

In Louisiana, $700,023 was obligated to 10 new projects, which included $50,067 for the acquisition of 43 acres and $649,956 for development of recreation facilities. Nine projects were sponsored by local units of government; and one project was state-sponsored.

In New Mexico, $924,300 was obligated to 44 new projects, which included $30,000 for the acquisition of 2 acres and $844,300 for development of recreation facilities. Forty-three projects were sponsored by local units of government; and one project was state-sponsored. New Mexico received a planning grant for $50,000.

In Oklahoma, $1,538,778 was obligated to 29 new projects as all development of recreation facilities. Twenty-one projects were sponsored by local units of government; and eight projects were state-sponsored.

In Texas, $4,284,965 was obligated to 34 new projects, which included $2,338,971 for the acquisition of 494 acres of recreational land at 12 sites and $1,945,994 for development of recreation facilities. All 34 projects were sponsored by local units of government.

Relationship Between the OPSP and SCORP

In all five States, new L&WCF projects approved in FY 1984 reflect priority issues identified in the individual Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans (SCORPs) and the Open Project Selection Processes (OPSPs).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Arkansas' OPSP is so closely related to the SCORP that 17 of the 26 SCORP issues were addressed in the funding of FY 1984 projects. Some of the SCORP priorities addressed were: the protection and access to streams, 3 projects; recognition of the natural usefulness of floodplains, 6 projects; energy conservation, 4 projects; meeting the recreation needs of urban residents, 17 projects; private sector involvement, 2 projects; and a serious effort to meet the needs of special populations, 5 projects. Mammoth Spring, the largest spring in the State and McArthur Park, Little Rock's first park, help link recreation to Arkansas' Cultural Heritage. Nine projects were oriented towards income generation and address funding and increased operation and maintenance cost issues identified in the SCORP. The need for additional urban and rural trails was a SCORP element addressed in five other projects. The OPSP provides additional points for projects readily accessible to the public, which conserve energy, meet the needs of special populations and focus on the reduction of vandalism. Thus the OPSP helps shape project scope to better reflect needs identified in the SCORP.

One section of the Louisiana OPSP directly addresses the project elements proposed in each project and scores them on how they meet the highest priority general needs identified in the SCORP and State Action Program, as well as the top 10 specific facility needs statewide and within each region of the State. Twenty-five percent of the possible points in the OPSP are tied directly to the SCORP. All 10 new projects funded included one or more of the top facility needs: swimming pools, 1 project; trails, 2 projects; baseball fields, 5 projects; playgrounds, 2 projects; picnic facilities, 5 projects; and tennis courts, 3 projects. The most prevalent general need addressed in the SCORP and the FY 1984 projects was acquisition and development where there exists little or no recreation. Sixty-two percent of the funds helped improve recreational opportunity for significant minority populations, low and moderate income residents, the elderly, handicapped and youth.

Both the New Mexico SCORP and the OPSP identified several high priorities where improvements are needed to meet the needs of New Mexico citizens. Neighborhood parks were identified as the number one priority in almost half of the State. Thirty-eight of the new FY 1984 funded projects provided some form of neighborhood facility, including soccer fields, ballfields, courts, play areas and handicapped access to small lakes. Most of the new fields were primarily for soccer, a rapidly growing sport in New Mexico. Twenty projects provided for playground development.

Because of an increase in urban population, the acquisition and preservation of open space has become another high priority; four projects provided for the development of open space. While some type of jogging trail, bike trail or foot path was included in several projects, three projects were funded exclusively for bike trail development, which is another high priority in the SCORP and OPSP.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In Oklahoma, under the OPSP, special emphasis was placed on those projects which reflected a local and regional need for the facilities as defined in the SCORP. Issues for project selection include a demand for softball and baseball facilities. Eight projects were funded for the development or improvements of ballfields. The SCORP also identifies tennis activity as a demand and need which "has deficiencies most notable in the regions containing SMSA's." Four court development projects in major population centers were funded. Other needs addressed included camping opportunities, swimming pools and picnic facilities.

In Texas, all FY 1984 L&WCF funds were allocated to local communities in 34 projects. The OPSP and Texas Outdoor Recreation Plan objectives met through these projects include providing a more balanced mix and wider variety of recreation opportunities in 25 projects, improving the geographic distribution of facilities in all 11 projects and meeting the recreational needs of handicapped, low income, elderly and minority citizens at 11 sites. Other objectives met included decreasing the relative differences between supply and demand, improving water related opportunities and encouraging joint use efforts with schools.

The States of Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas received requests for more than $35,261,000 in new L&WCF funds, and funded $8,432,828 of these new requests. The competitive levels in each State for FY 1984 are illustrated below:

State	Number of Projects Received by States & Total Federal Assistance Requested		Number of Projects Funded by NPS and Federal Amount	
AR	42	$ 1,076,463*	41	$ 1,029,001
LA	101	14,200,000	49	1,626,483
NM	117	4,500,000	55	1,095,765
OK	89	2,660,275	86	1,927,410
TX	88	12,874,265	35	4,286,846
TOTAL	437	$ 35,311,003	266	$ 9,965,505

*Arkansas limits the amount of any request to a maximum of $50,000, therefore, this figure is substantially less than the total project costs.

State Perceptions of the OPSP

All of the States in the Southwest Region felt the implementation of the OPSP helped to improve the image of the L&WCF program by providing a method by which communities know in advance how their project applications will be evaluated. The equitable consideration of applications and the incorporation of identified needs and objectives of the SCORP into the process are viewed as being highly beneficial. It was noted, however, that a continuing problem encountered in selection of new projects is the comparative lower level of available Federal funding assistance to the States from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Expenditures in FY 1984

All Southwest Region States made remarkable progress in reducing their unexpended balances and in completing projects started in previous years. Total billings during the year amounted to $13,382,326, which included final billings on 202 separate projects.

FY 1984 was the first year the National Park Service established unexpended balance targets for each State. With the exception of Texas, which was 14 percent above its target figure for FY 1984, all Southwest Region's States exceeded their target expenditure goals. Arkansas exceeded its goal by 46 percent and Oklahoma by 18 percent. An analysis of 5-year old or older projects compared to the number of active projects reveals that Arkansas and New Mexico have only 2 percent and 6 percent respectively of active older grants. This figure is exceptionally low and reflects a significant effort by these States to improve fiscal management.

SCORP

The 1985 Arkansas Assessment and Policy Plan took a serious look at real problems and associated recommendations in what is referred to in the SCORP as a "good new/bad new" story. A special study, "Whitewater Recreation in Arkansas," was released, and a previous study, "So, You Want to Build a Park," went into a second printing. Other accomplishments of the program include completion of a statewide public survey, and compilation of an inventory of public recreation areas and facilities. The SCORP was used to take a strong position in the debate over additional wilderness designations in the State. Acreage included in the Arkansas Wilderness Act is the largest of all the "eastern wilderness bills" enacted into law. The SCORP also provided a base from which highway relocations, stream dredgings, hydropower installations, and airport expansions could be reviewed.

In Louisiana, major SCORP related efforts focused on updating the existing site inventory and updating the Louisiana State Parks Plan for 1985. The Recreation Tourism and Wildlife Committee was active in exchanging information on current construction projects and future plans; thus improving coordination among all agencies concerned with parks and recreation. As a direct result of this coordination, an inventory of public boat ramps was completed which will help future administration of increased boating facilities funds under the Wallop Breaux Sport Fishing Assistance Program. The SCORP provided direction for several statewide projects including the State Water Plan accepted by the Legislature and resulting in establishment of a Water Resources Advisory Committee. SCORP input was used for the brochure "Louisiana Outdoors" which covers a variety of outdoor activities and a description of locations. Various U.S. Army Corps of Engineers studies relied on SCORP information, especially in the development of the cost/benefit methodology for a proposed Fort Livingston State Commemorative Area protective rock jetty.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Major SCORP planning activity in New Mexico concentrated on trails. A State trail inventory was updated and a contract was signed between the Natural Resources Department and a non-profit volunteer organization to design a publicity and training program to attract volunteers to the Adopt-A-Trail program. An Adopt-A-Trail Handbook on trail maintenance and a promotional brochure were produced. One SCORP implementation accomplishment was a memorandum of understanding among seven land managing agencies to standardize trail terminology and maintenance procedures. In addition to trails, a survey of recreational water craft users was conducted to ascertain origin, destination, preferences, attitudes and activities of the boating public. New Mexico completed its 1984-85 Outdoor Recreation Action Program. Work on the 1986 SCORP Update was begun with a focus on an Outdoor Recreation Information System to provide "supply" data.

A major focus of Oklahoma's SCORP activity was on multiple inventories, studies, and research to be used for the development of the next Assessment and Policy Plan. An outdoor Recreation Resource Inventory, an Energy Conservation study, a supplement to the original Trails Plan and a private sector inventory of businesses involved in recreation provision and supply were all completed. Several Planning Manuals were produced including: the Oklahoma Trails Manual, Handicapped Planning Mannual, State Bicycle Plan and Interpretive Planning Workbook. In addition to contracting recreational demand surveys, the Tourism and Recreation Department was involved in the Eleventh Annual Governors Conference on Tourism and Recreation. An updated Assessment/Policy Plan and a new biennial Action Program were published in 1984.

The 1985 Texas Outdoor Recreation Plan's (TORP) Assessment and Policy Plan was completed and the OPSP revised to reflect the new issues. Texas also completed a new 1984-85 Outdoor Recreation Action Program during the year. Strategies were developed with the Texas Agricultural Extension Service and the Governor's Office of Budget and Planning for funding to develop research and data concerning crime and vandalism. Seven workshops on methods of preventing and reducing park vandalism were conducted. A Round Table Advisory Group of conservation and public interest groups was created to assist the chairman of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission. Other Texas Parks and Wildlife Department activities include the initiating of a State wildlife habitat acquisition program funded by State Waterfowl Stamp proceeds, submission of a request to the Legislature to up-grade the Texas Natural Heritage Program; development of a pilot Texas Conservation Corps Program, completion of four State Parks Master Plans and increases in lands managed directly for wildlife purposes to 357,716 acres. These efforts were all tied to the TORP.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BLANK PAGE

ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION SUMMARY

The Rocky Mountain Region consists of the States of Colorado, Montana, North and South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming. Duri g fiscal year 1984, these States received a total of $3,396,770 in assistance for 118 new projects. Of the total new projects, 10 were state-sponsored and 108 involved local units of government. An additional $1,817,560 was utilized for amendments to existing projects.

During the year, projects totalling $260,033 in assistance were approved for the acquisition of 869 acres of land for open space and recreation; a total of $2,999,318 in assistance was used for new development or rehabilitation of existing facilities; and $137,419 in assistance was approved for planning projects. The types of facilities constructed included 93 projects with support facilities (landscaping, utilities, walkways, comfort stations, etc.), 67 projects with sports and playfields (baseball, tennis courts, playgrounds, etc.), 44 projects with picnic areas (family site, group shelter), and 15 projects with trails (hiking, biking, exercise, etc.); most projects involved multiple facilities.

Following is a State-by-State summary of grant and planning activity in each State.

COLORADO

The primary outdoor recreation issues identified in the current Colorado Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) planning process are open space, trails, development of urban use facilities, recreational rivers, and reservoir based recreation. Every project funded in FY 1984 satisfied one or more of these issues. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the State's current Open Project Selection Process in rating projects according to their relevance to the high priority issues identified in the SCORP.

During the year Colorado almost lost some FY 1983 reapportionment funds and some new apportionment monies for FY 1985 due to its poor outlay rate. In order to resolve this problem they have implemented a number of new measures. These include 1) a computer monitoring system on all active projects, 2) letters to all sponsors urging rapid outlay of funds, 3) meetings with the Colorado Parks and Recreation Association to emphasize expenditure problems, 4) reduction in project periods, 5) new criteria in the Open Project Selection Process to reward sponsors with good exependiture records, 6) establishment of a new billing procedure for State projects and 7) establishing of new goals for completion of state-sponsored capital construction projects. The State anticipates that these measures will result in major improvements in the outlay rate for FY 1985.

MONTANA

The FY 1984 issue/priority categories for Montana are broken down on the basis of local expenditures vs. state expenditures. L&WCF priorities for local expenditures were projects which 1) met specific local needs, 2) provided both active and passive participation, 3) may be used for two or more seasons of the year and 4) accommodate a variety of recreational uses. The priorities for state expenditures were projects, 1) earmarked by the State Legislature, 2) that conserved the scenic, archeological, scientific, and recreational resources

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of the State, 3) which aided people management and law enforcement, 4) near population centers, 5) which serve as destination areas, 6) for inholdings at existing sites and 7) which provide a trail experience. In the area of local expenditures the majority of the projects funded met all four priorities. None of the projects met less than two. On the other hand, for State expenditures priority (1) was the only one that was generally satisfied with only a few projects also satisfying the other priorities.

During the year all incorporated cities and towns, all counties and all public and private schools, universities, and colleges in Montana were surveyed by mail to determine the statewide inventory of ten key recreational facilities. A good response was received in all categories. These responses will be alphabetized and categorized in booklet form for use when reviewing L&WCF grant applications.

NORTH DAKOTA

The recreation priorities for North Dakota as identified through the SCORP process are 1) facilities which enhance and protect recreation resources, 2) donation acquisitions, 3) recreation trails and 4) projects which provide the most popular activities within the State; i.e., swimming pools, tennis courts, skating rinks, park areas, and ball diamonds.

In 1984 three projects totalling $90,540 were funded under priority (1). Five acquisitions through donation were accomplished resulting in 398.45 acres of new recreation land valued at $183,773.95. A jogging exercise trail project for $8,250 met priority (3). Eleven projects totalling $207,426 were funded to satisfy the fourth priority.

The North Dakota Recreation and Park Association is proposing legislation to develop a park and recreation leadership and facilities grant program. The leadership program would be available to communities under 13,000 population on a 25/75 matching basis. The facilities program would be available to all communities. Funding for both would be generated from a proposed two cent per pack cigarette tax.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The 1984 South Dakota Action Plan identifies 13 priorities for L&WCF funding. The identified priorities are water based recreation in Southeastern South Dakota; boating access; community recreation; renovation projects; new ballfields, soccer fields, and golf courses; ballfield upgrading; interpretive resources; preservation and protection of natural resources; recreation trails; new court facilities; picnicking; playground equipment; and restroom and drinking water facilities. All of the projects funded during FY 1984 met one or more of these priorities.

The most notable accomplishment for South Dakota in SCORP planning during the year was progress made in reestablishing a full time SCORP position. The FY 1986 budget includes such a position as well as funding for contractural services needed to complete the State Planning Process. This accomplishment is significant because it represents a marked change in the State's attitude toward SCORP which had dwindled to virtually nothing in 1982 when the L&WCF grants program received no funding.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UTAH

The Utah SCORP addresses several issues which relate to projects approved in 1984 through their Open Project Selection Process. For example planned water and waterways projects were a major priority in Utah. One project for $90,101.00 was approved under this priority during the year. Another priority was economic and cost effective recreation. A single project valued at $54,000.00 was approved in 1984 under this high priority activity. A third priority of the State SCORP was solutions to overall recreation problems. The majority of applications approved in 1984 fell into this category. A final priority was effective and responsive coordination. One project for $199,997.96 was approved to meet this objective.

During the year Utah completed a report entitled "Conservation Easements." This report reviews the laws and strategies involved in the acquisition of fee simple and less-than-fee simple properties. This information will be beneficial to the State in its assessment of preservation and conservation policies regarding natural resources.

WYOMING

The Wyoming SCORP identifies specific priorities for facilities (i.e. ballfields and tennis courts) on a region by region basis. This creates a problem in project selection because most L&WCF projects submitted are for general park development, thus certain aspects of a project may satisfy the highest priority needs of a region while others may not. In order to address the problem, the Wyoming Recreation Commission uses their Open Project Selection rating system in conjunction with their general knowledge of the State's needs and problems. In general they have been successful in this approach, as the projects selected do address both the overall regional needs of the State as well as individual community needs.

Due to the boom and bust nature of the energy industry, Wyoming suffers from tremendous population fluctuations. Because their SCORP planning process is done on a five-year cycle, these population changes have created unique problems in calculating long-term recreation needs. For this reason, Wyoming's annual Action Programs has taken on greater significance than in some other States.

Recreation Planning and Projects

Action Programs were completed during the year by Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. In addition, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming used L&WCF planning grants to assist in funding their recreation planning efforts. Other highlights of the Rocky Mountain States include the continued use of the Colorado State Lottery as a funding source for local government recreation projects, completion of the Montana State Lands Inventory to determine the acreage of School Trust Land available to sportsmen, a State Park Economic Impact Study in North Dakota, and completion of a study on recreation and the elderly by Utah.

Examples of some of the more significant projects funded in the Rocky Mountain Region in FY 1984 include: Evanston Railroad Park in Wyoming (total cost $97,530.00), Washington Swimming Pool, Utah (total cost $315,000.00), the Peace Garden Improvements, North Dakota (total cost $164,000.00), and Pheasant Run Park, Greeley, Colorado (total cost $107,150.00).

State Program recommendations included: 1) broadening of L&WCF eligibility criteria to include indoor facilities in cold weather states; 2) establishment of a L&WCF Trust Fund; and 3) Shifting the emphasis of SCORP from overall comprehensive planning to L&WCF grant allocation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MIDWEST REGION SUMMARY

The Midwest Region includes the States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, and Wisconsin. During fiscal year 1984, these States received a total of $21,196,373 in assistance for 367 new projects. Of the total new projects, 63 were state-sponsored and 304 involved local units of government.

During the year, projects totaling $9,463,387 in assistance were approved for acquisition of 6,428 acres of land for open space and recreation; a total of $11,652,086 in assistance was used for new development or rehabilitation of existing facilities; and $80,900 in assistance was approved for planning projects. Types of facilities constructed included 285 projects with support facilities (landscaping, utilities, comfort stations, etc.), 191 projects with sports and playfields (ball fields, tennis courts, playgrounds, etc.), 134 projects with picnic areas (family site, group shelters), 88 projects with trails (hiking, biking, exercise, etc.), 28 projects with camping areas (tent sites, group campgrounds, etc.), 27 projects with winter sports facilities (skating rink, ski runs, snowmobile trails, etc.), and 23 projects with fishing facilities (piers, stream access, etc.); most projects involved multiple facilities.

Project selections continued to be based on Open Project Selection Processes (OPSP) as adopted by the States and approved by the Service. In all cases, the OPSP gives emphasis to projects meeting priorities set forth in the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans (SCORP).

Departures from the traditional types of projects of the early years of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) program are directly related to budgetary constraints and changing demands. For example, the number of development projects far exceeds acquisition ones at the present time. This change in emphasis reflects the attitude that the recreation community must do a better job of managing the existing recreation estate, including developing those lands previously acquired. Secondly, all OPSP's stress the importance of meeting close-to-home needs, thus explaining the growth in urban types of facilities such as sports and playfields. State projects continue to have a resource orientation consisting of the development of facilities such as trails, water access, and camping areas.

Equally important to the funding of projects is their timely completion. During this past year, considerable effort was put forth by the States to accelerate the completion of funded projects. In some cases, this required the addition of State staff on either a permanent and/or temporary basis. It also involved making administrative changes which included imposing more restrictive project time limits, alterations in the recurring grants cycle to speed up obligations, and increased monitoring of active projects. Most States now are operating within a maximum initial project period of 3 years. One of the more restrictive programs has been implemented by the State of Illinois. Each L&WCF participant must complete the final application process within 90 days of being notified of the project's selection for funding. Acquisition projects must be completed within 9 months of receiving approval with exceptions granted when condemnation is required. Development projects must be completed within 18 months of the approval date.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

During FY 1984, requests for fund assistance exceeded the L&WCF apportionments by a ratio of about 5:1. Reportedly, the need is far greater; but due to a number of factors, many communities are unwilling or unable to participate. One reason given is that the costs of putting together an application are not worth the gamble in view of the keen competition for few available dollars. State efforts to spread program benefits among as many constituents as possible also had had a dampening effect. These include limiting a jurisdiction to a single application per year and the imposition of monetary lids on a project. The costs of acquisition and development in the Midwest's current economic climate are seen as prohibitive to undertaking and completing priority projects when maximum dollar limitations are established for fund assistance. Local and State budgetary constraints, which have been most severe in some older industrial areas, are forcing changes in priorities and associated cutbacks in services.

STATE-BY-STATE COMPETITIONS FOR L&WCF GRANTS IN FY 1984

STATE	# OF APPLICATIONS RECEIVED	$ REQUESTED (FEDERAL SHARE)	# OF GRANTS AWARDED	FY 84 FUNDS AWARDED
IL	62	8,800,000	18	2,831,860
IN	74	3,732,520	20	1,586,583
IA	61	1,406,128	26	1,009,056
KS	28	2,302,619	11	945,133
MI	277	18,148,928	40	2,423,417
MN	261	8,956,525	28	1,300,403
MO	109	3,600,000	34	1,454,856
NE	75	1,850,000	38	814,934
OH	132	15,292,723	27	2,699,815
WI	168	6,606,009	29	1,425,238
TOTALS	1,247	70,695,452	271	16,491,295

Budgetary shortfalls at the State level have forced a majority of Midwest States to waive their long established policies of evenly sharing the annual L&WCF apportionment between State and local participants. During FY 1984, local units of government were beneficiaries of 77 percent of the fund assistance provided for new projects. Exceptions to this pattern occurred in the States of Kansas and Minnesota where the traditional 50-50 split was observed. It also should be noted that Michigan, in implementing their newly approved OPSP, requires State and local applicants to compete for available grant moneys on even terms.

A number of new initiatives have been undertaken by the States which conceivably could provide some relief to the financial plight facing the recreation community. Several of these appear to be motivated on the basis of the role recreation plays in the overall economy of the area. In 1984, the Iowa legislature established a "Public Outdoor Recreation and Resource Fund" thus creating a mechanism for a cost-sharing program between the State and its local political

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

subdivisions for recreation/tourism projects. While no appropriations to this Fund have been made to date, the Act provides authority to appropriate monies from general revenues. In Illinois, an additional tax has been imposed, principally on soft drinks and hotel/motel charges, to finance tourism-related activities. From this "Tourism Fund," $10 million annually is to be allocated to the Park and Conservation Fund for upgrading and improving State parks and other Department of Conservation facilities. Through a constitutional amendment, Missouri voters approved an increase in the State sales tax by one-tenth of 1 percent with half of the proceeds to be used for maintaining and improving State parks. This tax increase is authorized for a 5-year period and is expected to generate $30+ million in 1985-86. A constitutional amendment also was passed in Michigan that will permanently dedicate oil and gas revenues from State lands for use by State and local units of government for acquisition and development of recreation lands and facilities. This amendment affects the "Michigan Land Trust" and permits, for the first time, up to 25 percent of the proceeds to be used for development, Ohio established a 2-year $3 million "Lake Erie Access Program" to provide funding assistance to local communities. The funds for this program are part of over $50 million in Ohio's capital improvement appropriation for various departmental projects on Lake Erie. The latter units of government must bear a minimum of 50 percent of the costs for projects providing public access to the lake in order to qualify. Nebraska increased their State Park Entry Permit fees and imposed a $5 Trout Stamp for the first time. In addition, the fledgling Nebraska Game and Parks Foundation already is involved in expanding private donations available as a match for State L&WCF projects.

The L&WCF program and SCORP plans, either directly or indirectly, have been instrumental in providing the basis for these legislative actions. Ohio's Lake Erie Access Program was the direct result of a SCORP element and resultant recommendation. In addition, it is important to note that Michigan plans to use basic L&WCF requirements for implementing the "Land Trust" constitutional amendment provisions.

SCORP activities continue among the States with some attention currently being given to the impacts of recreation upon the economy. Illinois continues their study of the economic significance of recreation. Iowa initiated a 1-year study effort to anlayze recreation, tourism, and leisure in Iowa under the overall guidance of a legislative committee including representation from the Iowa Development Commission, the Iowa Conservation Commission, the Governor's Office, and the State legislature. Wisconsin, under a new L&WCF planning grant, is conducting a study of the importance of outdoor recreation to Wisconsin residents which includes an evaluation of outdoor recreation and expenditures. The Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, in cooperation with the Department of Economic Development, continues to expand its data base on economic impacts of outdoor recreation by Nebraskans.

New Action Programs were published by the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Wisconsin. The newly approved Policy and Assessment Plans for Illinois and Indiana were published and distributed during the year, States with active L&WCF planning grants in 1984 included Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio and Wisconsin.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BLANK PAGE

SOUTHEAST REGION SUMMARY

The Southeast Region includes the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. During fiscal year 1984, these States received a total of $25,984,078 in assistance for 388 new projects. Of the total new projects, 36 were state-sponsored and 352 involved local units of government.

During the year, projects totalling $8,721,320 in assistance were approved for the acquisition of 49,241 acres of land for open space and recreation; a total of $16,684,036 in assistance was used for new development or rehabilitation of existing facilities; and $578,722 in assistance was approved for planning projects. Types of facilities constructed included 35 projects with support facilities (landscaping, utilities, walkways, lighting comfort stations, etc.), 256 projects with sports and playfields (baseball, tennis courts, playgrounds, etc.), 176 projects with picnic areas (family site, group shelters), 81 projects with trails (hiking, biking, exercise, etc.), and 30 projects with swimming facilities (pools, swimming beach, bathhouse, etc.); most projects involved multiple facilities. Access to water areas received very high priority for funding in this Region.

Projects in this Region were used to meet recreational needs in both urban and rural areas and for rehabilitation of park facilities.

The Open Project Selection Processes were effectively used in the selection of all L&WCF projects. In most cases, project selection was affected by the need to tailor costs of individual projects to available funds, thus limiting the total amounts of money available for each project. Puerto Rico, however, has begun development of two Federal surplus real properties that have been "out-of-compliance" with the Federal Real Property program for years. Phase I has commenced on Vega Baja (to be called Tortuguero Park) with funding of $533,241 and Phase I of Fort Buchanan with funding of $680,184.

Some program highlights for the year include a study initiated in Florida to evaluate the potential of abandoned railroads for meeting recreation needs. Unmet demands for recreational trail activities exist in every planning region in Florida. This study will examine the large number of railroad abandonments in the State and evaluate their feasibility for meeting recreation trail needs.

In Alabama, two Section 6(f) conversion situations were resolved during the year, one at Munny Sokol Park in Tuscaloosa and the other at Fort Mitchell Recreation Park in Russell County. Alabama also began acquisition of a four-phased acquisition project (Ruffner Mountain in Birmingham), a 480-acre natural area which the Trust for Public Lands had acquired as an intermediary.

Nearly all of the States in this Region (especially Georgia, Tennessee, Puerto Rico, and Kentucky) have adopted a more aggressive policy for billing out unliquidated obligations. They have consequently reduced their balances considerably. All States have also become more realistic in setting shorter project periods, rather than the earlier 5-year project period.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

South Carolina used its Recreation Land Trust Fund, a State funding source, to fund the acquisition portion of all projects seeking acquisition funds, thus freeing up the L&WCF apportionment to fund more development projects.

Kentucky has relocated its planning function within the L&WCF Branch. This organizational change is aimed at better coordination between planning and grants administration. A new technical assistance program will also be a part of the planning function and will assist communities with the establishment of recreation and park departments.

Tennessee passed a $2 million appropriation under the Governor's "Safe Growth" initiative, earmarked for the acquisition and/or protection of unique cultural, historical, and natural areas. Approximately $950,000 of this fund is earmarked for 10 priority natural areas in the State.

Florida is also concerned with growth. The Florida Legislature adopted an innovative growth management law designed to ensure that adequate services are provided and that Florida's sensitive ecosystems are protected as development is carried out to accommodate the influx of new residents. The Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) is expected to contribute significantly to other planning involved in this growth study.

North Carolina, under the present SCORP planning grant, has developed a Community Recreation Needs Model. They will apply it to specific communities in the State to determine needs for basic recreation services and interpret the findings for the local governments. North Carolina also reported being very pleased with their public meetings as a part of the planning process. They held seven regional meetings which produced recommendations for a Legislative Study Commission to act on.

States in the Southeast Region maintained active SCORP programs during the year. These efforts included the completion of new Assessment/Policy Plans by Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Tennessee. In addition, new Action Programs were completed by Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and the Virgin Islands. Seven States in the Region used L&WCF planning assistance grants to help fund their SCORP efforts.

Mississippi lost its eligibility to participate in the L&WCF grants program on September 30, 1984, because it did not have an updated Action Program completed on schedule, and the one later submitted lacked sufficient information for it to receive approval by the Region. In addition, Mississippi had fallen far behind in completing other elements of its SCORP Program as called for in the schedule established in the L&WCF planning project which it received to help fund its SCORP Program. However, the State has made considerable progress lately in catching up on its schedule and completing the plans required to regain its eligibility.

The Virgin Islands lost its eligibility to participate in the L&WCF program on September 1, 1984, because of failure to submit an updated Assessment/Policy Plan and Action Program, which were due on April 1, 1984. However, the Virgin Islands has recently completed draft plans which have been reviewed by the Region and are now in the process of being finalized.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MID-ATLANTIC REGION SUMMARY

The Mid-Atlantic Region includes the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia and the District of Columbia. During fiscal year 1984, these States received $28,358,107 in assistance for 295 new projects. Of the total new projects, 79 were state-sponsored and 216 involved local units of government. At the same time, the States expended $59.7 million in L&WCF funds which resulted in a 27 percent reduction in the unexpended balance.

During the year, projects totalling $6,608,730 in assistance were approved for the acquisition of 4,609 acres of land for open space and recreation, a total $20,276,568 in assistance was used for new development or rehabilitation of existing facilities, and $1,472,809 in assistance was approved for planning projects. The types of facilitiess constructed included 218 projects with support facilities (landscaping, utilities, walkways, comfort stations, etc.), 138 projects with sports and playfields (baseball, tennis courts, playgrounds, etc.), 67 projects with picnic areas (family site, group shelter), 45 projects with trails (hiking, biking, excercise, etc.), and 34 projects with swimming facilities (pools, swimming beach, bathhouse, etc.); most projects involved multiple facilities.

An additional 336.7 acres of land were donated to project sponsors and used as a match for Federal funds. In addition, the Regional Office has assisted the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania in land use analysis and potential benefits of a donation from the DuPont Company of a 1,700 acre tract to be called the White Clay Creek Preserve. Delaware expects to utilize the appraised value of the 500 acres in their State as a matching share for other L&WCF assisted State park acquisition and development projects.

Almost all of the 79 Job Act projects funded in FY 83 were sucessfully completed in FY 1984, with 85% of the $10.8 million obligated to them expended by September 30.

Open Project Selection Process (OPSP)

The Mid-Atlantic States report that their OPSPs were in full operation during FY 1984, and that they the process had positive effects on project selection in terms of providing grants for the highest priority needs. Following are specific State comments on OPSP implementation.

Maine provided the following comments and concerns regarding OPSP:

1. The availability of State funds to match L&WCF monies has been the limiting factor in the monies used for State projects, since State projects are generally given priority over local projects.

2. The timing of funding rounds was found to eliminate some good proposals and to promote a few marginal proposals, but has tended to increase program visibility.

3. The years in which there were two rounds did not yield improvement of projects, but more than doubled staff workload.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. The OPSP was used to its full advantage during the December 1984 funding round due to reduced L&WCF funding levels.

5. Discussion of each project and concurrence of its nature by two raters gave improved consistency in ratings.

New Hampshire reported that a $35,000 per sponsor funding limit was imposed on the 1985 grant round, severely restricting the size and scale of individual projects in many cases. However, the funding limit allowed more sponsors the chance to participate in the L&WCF program. The necessity for the funding cap per community has created a less than 50% match program for land acquisition and/or development projects of much beyond the $70,000 limit.

New Jersey noted that the effectiveness of their project selection process was somewhat hampered by inability to project funding levels from year-to-year.

Pennsylvania reported that their OPSP was quite cumbersome and a burden to implement last year because of the department's reduction in staffing and budget.

Rhode Island implemented the OPSP for the first time in FY 1984. The State is now amending their OPSP guidelines for the Recreation Resources Review Committee to provide clearer direction for the scoring and award process.

The following table shows competitive levels by State for L&WCF project selection in fiscal year 1984:

	Number of Requests & Dollars Requested in State Competitions		Number and Dollars of Projects Funded	
CONNECTICUT	40	$ 6,044,747.00	12	$ 1,552,261.50
DELAWARE	22	1,200,000.00	22	890,475.00
DIST. OF COLUMBIA	6	500,000.00	4	175,569.00
MAINE	23	2,096,351.38	23	2,096,351.38
MARYLAND	15	9,675,039.00	8	1,674,950.50
MASSACHUSETTS	39	4,323,552.00	18	2,294,444.00
NEW HAMPSHIRE	43	908,350.00	24	849,592.00
NEW JERSEY	193	113,200,000.00	3	2,650,000.00
NEW YORK	206	33,700,000.00	23	5,702,321.00
PENNSYLVANIA	333	19,963,119.00	66	3,502,788.00
RHODE ISLAND	57	3,945,923.00	5	604,569.00
VERMONT	40	2,033,164.00	39	1,755,559.26
VIRGINIA	31	3,656,375.00	13	2,421,195.00
WEST VIRGINIA	42	2,718,853.00	26	2,180,800.00
Totals	1,090	$203,965,473.38	286	$28,350,875.64 *

* Remainder of funds obligated in FY 1984 were for amendments to existing projects.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State Planning and Grants Accomplishments

Following is a state-by-state summary of grant and planning activity in each State.

CONNECTICUT

The State of Connecticut closed out 21 projects and made 2 withdrawals during FY 1984 thereby reducing its unexpended balance by over $2.8 million.

In its State planning program, Connecticut began targeted demand studies which seek to analyze the results of demand studies done under a previous SCORP planning project, to determine which groups were under-represented in the original survey. Additional demand information will be gathered for the targeted group. In addition, an advanced demand supply analysis has begun which will examine all current demand studies to determine useful categorizations that might be related in a meaningful way to supply quantities. The State is also conducting a feasibility study to explore the desirability and cost effectiveness of a computer assisted planning system for recreational land use.

DELAWARE

Historically, the State of Delaware's record for overall administration of the L&WCF program has been excellent. This is particularly evident in their obligation of funds and high expenditure rate. The State's unexpended balance at the end of the fiscal year was reduced to $1.2 million. Delaware's SCORP efforts during the year included an update of its Assessment/ Policy Plan and Action Program. These efforts were funded in part under a L&WCF planning grant.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The District of Columbia has made moderate progress towards expending funds obligated before FY 1984 and closing out older grants. Their unexpended balance has been reduced to $1.8 million during the past year.

The District of Columbia is also using L&WCF planning funds to assist in its SCORP Program. Efforts underway include: the completion of a maintenance management system, the development of a management information system, and a user preference survey to households to obtain data for the next five-year Assessment/Policy Plan, due in 1986.

MAINE

Significant progress has been made towards reducing the unexpended balance in Maine. A sustained effort should have equally effective results for meeting future target goals.

Maine used L&WCF planning funds to assist in conducting its SCORP program. Work underway includes the Maine Rivers easement and acquisition plan, the Union River and Carrabassett River studies, and a study of tourism within the State.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MARYLAND

Toward the close of FY 1984, the State of Maryland submitted a plan to work towards reducing their combined unobligated and unexpended balance by approximately $9.2 million to reach the fiscal year outlay targets. Administrative improvements in managing the program have made the difference in Maryland's efforts to meet the fiscal year targets.

Maryland's accomplishments in its SCORP program include completion of the Patuxent River Recreation and Open Space Plan in draft form. In addition, staff continued updating the computerized system which contains natural resources and land use information for the State's land base. Work was also begun in revising the methodology used in Maryland's "Acreage and Facility Requirements" report.

MASSACHUSETTS

In Massachusetts, discussion centered around overall administration of the L&WCF, with particular emphasis on the need for increased State staffing to improve management of the program. As a result, great improvement in reducing the unexpended balance and project closure is foreseen for FY 1985. Expenditures totaled $2,024,201.41 or 2 1/4 times more than new obligations.

Massachusetts completed a new Assessment/Policy Plan and an Action Program. As a result of the State's SCORP, a $150 million bond issue was passed for parks, recreation, and conservation programs for State and local agencies. Massachusetts used L&WCF planning funds to assist in its SCORP Program.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire used L&WCF planning funds to assist in maintaining its SCORP Program. The first phase of a two-year natural areas inventory was completed, under contract to the Nature Conservancy. In addition, the year-long lakes study was completed in draft form. The main result of the study was a series of recommended policies and actions necessary for a well-managed lake system. Completion of "how-to" booklet entitled "Friends of Recreation: Getting Started," offers guidance on how such an organization can be formed in support of community recreation.

NEW JERSEY

FY 1984 was a year that saw noticeable improvement in the management of the State of New Jersey's Land and Water Conservation Fund program. From having one of the five highest unexpended balances in the nation three years ago, New Jersey has reduced its unexpended balance by nearly $10 million.

New Jersey's SCORP efforts included the preparation of management plans for Island Beach and Swimming River Natural areas, and completion of Wild and Scenic Rivers designations. The State contracted with the Nature Conservancy to develop a mapped inventory of diverse and significant natural features statewide. In conjunction with implementing its $135 million Green Acres Bond Issue which was passed in November 1983, New Jersey is working toward strengthening local planning requirements that will assist in evaluating projects under the local project priority system.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEW YORK

The State of New York prepared a comprehensive strategy paper to address major management problems relating to expenditures and project closures. The State's strategy has aggressive short and long-term goals, fully supported by the SLO as the "highest priority." These billings facilitated the financial closure of a large number of older projects.

New York received a three-year L&WCF planning grant for $1 million, Federal share, to assist in maintaining its SCORP Program. Work completed during the year included the development of a computerized geographic information system for use in its park management analyses and linear recreation inventories. In addition, an operation/management survey was sent to over 300 public and private parks within the State. One of the State's park management studies in addressing the major park issues and viability of forest management at Alleghany State Park.

PENNSYLVANIA

The State of Pennsylvania has made considerable effort in closing out old projects and in improving their outlay rate. Good program management resulted in reducing the State's unexpended balance by almost $4 million in fiscal 1984.

Pennsylvania's SCORP accomplishments included completion of a new two-year Action Program. In addition, the State conducted a recreation opinion survey to obtain information on recreation needs on a regional and statewide basis. A "Swimming Pool Operations" Manual was also completed and distributed.

RHODE ISLAND

The State of Rhode Island made progress in eliminating the large backlog of projects expired but not closed out in previous years. The State completed action on 30 old projects and made progress on expending funds obligated before FY 1984.

Rhode Island's SCORP efforts included the development of conservation strategies for the Wood and Pawtucket Rivers and starting on master plans for Blackstone Linear Park, both projects with assistance from National Park Service staff.

VERMONT

Vermont closed out a number of older grants. Vermont's unexpended balance of projects approved before FY 1984 has been significantly lowered and progress to further reduce the balance and reach the NPS financial target appears to be progressing very well.

VIRGINIA

In fiscal year 1984, Virginia made extensive progress in reducing their unexpended balance and obligating their funds. Older State projects, as well as local projects, were financially completed and closed out.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Virginia completed its new 5-year Assessment/Policy Plan and 1984-86 Action Program. In addition, work has begun on a statewide trails study.

WEST VIRGINIA

The State of West Virginia has made excellent progress towards completing older grants and expending funds obligated before FY 1984. The State met its FY 1984 outlay target and closed out all older projects.

West Virginia's SCORP achievements included a survey of state and local officials to obtain information concerning recreation preferences, changes in participation rates, adequacy of facilities, and financing, personnel or operational problems faced by park administrators. The results will assist in the development of L&WCF priorities and SCORP implementation and Action Program priorities.

In addition, the State L&WCF staff helped to establish a West Virginia Recreation Resource File patterned after a similar file in New Hampshire. The file consists of a comprehensive library of indexed articles, reports and other resource materials on a broad range of topics of concern to local recreation managers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE CONCERNS

The Annual Report process encourages States to propose improvements and modifications in L&WCF grant, planning and administrative procedures, based on their experience with the program in previous years. Following is a summary of major concerns and issues raised by the States in fiscal 1984. A number of the administrative issues raised will be addressed by the Service in FY 1985 or will be the subject of continuing discussions with State agencies.

More Predictable Funding/Creation of National Trust.

States continue to be concerned about predictable levels of grant funding which they see as necessary for meaningful public and private participation in the program. They cite large investments that have been made in State and local L&WCF planning, project selection and monitoring systems to justify the need for consistency in grant funding. Twelve States and the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaision Officers made specific recommendations either for extension of Land and Water Conservation Fund appropriations authority, due to expire in 1989, or for establishment of a National Trust Fund for Recreation and Conservation programs. Eight States made more general suggestions for increased grant funding levels.

A Trust Fund, also proposed in 1983, would involve establishment of an interest bearing account made up of authorized L&WCF deposits from Outer Contiental Shelf mineral leasing revenues. This principal could be "invested" through loans to the general treasury or other special accounts, and the interest made available on an annual basis to provide an incentive for State and local park investments and to encourage ongoing planning and administrative efforts.

Stronger Federal Roles in Outdoor Recreation Policy, Research and Data Collection.

Most States also call for increased Federal efforts in supporting and coordinating research and planning efforts by State, local and private agencies. Tennessee and other States are particularly concerned that extensive outdoor recreation research by States, localities and universities may lead to wasteful duplication of efforts because of the lack of national standards for data collection and of a central clearinghouse to collect and disseminate research results. Several States also recommended a stronger leadership role by the Federal government in nationwide outdoor recreation planning and coordination of the policies of all the various Federal agencies involved in national, State, local and private recreation programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Support for National Outdoor Recreation Review Commission.

Eight States and the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers explicitly supported establishment of a new, national recreation commission to reassess national goals, needs and problems and to improve definition of Federal, State and local roles in providing recreation opportunities.

State Administrative Costs for L&WCF Grants.

Federal guidelines currently allow a portion of each grant reimbursement to be used to cover State administrative costs, under indirect cost rates negotiated on a State-by-State basis in accord with overall Federal grant regulations (OMB Circular A-87). Seven States (Hawaii, Florida, Missouri, New Mexico, Ohio, Texas, and West Virginia) argue that this approach is a cumbersome and unpredictable method of meeting on-going administrative expenses. These States have recommended, as they have in previous years, that the L&WCF Act be amended to provide direct grants to States for administrative costs.

Increasing State Authority for Review of Appraisals on Donated Lands.

Under current Federal regulations, the appraised values of land donated as part of a State or local match for a L&WCF grant must be reviewed by Federal (National Park Service) appraisers when the value exceeds $100,000. This provision is intended to promote nationwide uniformity in appraisal methods and prevent exaggeration in claims of donated value. Missouri, Ohio and Texas have suggested an increase in State review authority to include grants up to $500,000. These States argue that this would recognize the effects of inflation since the original limit was established.

Use of L&WCF Annual Expenditure Rates as Part of the Needs Formula for Apportionment and Reapportionment of Grant Funds.

Three States recommended changes in the method used to calculate expenditure targets for each State to take factors such as winter construction delays and variations in grant selection and obligation cycles into account. Three other States indicated their approval of the current use of expenditure targets as a way to reward States with good fiscal performances.

Simplicity and Uniformity of L&WCF Program Rules.

Six States expressed a general need for simplification of program requirements. The greatest emphasis was on improving the clarity of State outdoor recreation planning guidelines to provide: more uniform understanding of basic requirements; more guidance on eligible planning grant costs; and better information on the linkages between SCORP efforts, State selection of grant projects and NPS reviews of State program progress.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Use of Land Donations for State/Local Matching Share of L&WCF Grants.

L&WCF guidelines currently allow use of the appraised, fair-market value of lands donated to a L&WCF project as part of the non-Federal match to the Federal grant for combined acquisition and/or development. To maximize leveraging of the Federal funds amount, the guidelines require that such matches be freely given specifically as a part of the project being considered for funding. This means, for example, that lands dedicated by land developers under legal requirements of commercial or subdivision ordinances cannot be used for matching purposes because they are not voluntary donations related to the possible stimulative effects of Federal funding intended by the L&WCF Act. In addition, the cost of land appraisals that are required to document such matches must be borne entirely by the grantee, and cannot be included in project cost.

As in previous years, some States (Florida, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Texas) made recommendations for administrative changes to allow the value of lands dedicated under development ordinances to be used as a match for L&WCF grant to develop such sites. Several of these States also argue that the cost of land appraisals undertaken to document the value of donated lands, along with the land value, should be included as part of the grantee's matching share.

Simplification of Conversion Process for L&WCF Assisted Properties.

Florida, Missouri, Maine, Ohio, and Nebraska have recommended legislative relaxation of Section 6(f)(3) of the L&WCF Act which requires replacement in kind of any land converted to other than outdoor recreation use. In particular, these States think that some conversions to other public purposes (e.g. highway improvements, non-recreation public facility development) should be made easier. One State (Indiana) saw a need for reexamination of Section 6(f)(3) and similar Federal mandates to strengthen protection of Federal, State, and local parks against possible conversions or environmental intrusions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BLANK PAGE

APPENDIX

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BLANK PAGE

Table 1

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND APPROPRIATIONS
FY 1965 to FY 1985

FISCAL YEAR	L&WCF TOTAL	STATE GRANTS PORTION	FEDERAL PORTION *
1965	$ 16,000,000	$ 10,375,000	$ 5,625,000
1966	122,114,649	82,408,718	39,705,931
1967	95,006,590	56,531,090	38,475,500
1968	113,131,359	61,557,248	51,574,111
1969	111,500,000	45,000,000	66,500,000
1970	131,100,000	62,000,000	69,100,000
1971	357,400,000	185,400,000	172,000,000
1972	361,500,000	255,000,000	106,500,000
1973	300,000,000	181,800,000	118,200,000
1974	76,223,000	66,000,000	10,223,000
1975	307,492,000	180,000,000	127,492,000
1976	316,986,000	175,840,000	141,146,000
1976**	75,988,000	43,960,000	32,028,000
1977	537,799,000	175,516,000	362,283,000
1978	805,000,000	306,070,000	498,930,000
1979	737,025,000	369,790,000	367,235,000
1980	509,200,000	300,000,000	209,200,000
1981	288,593,000	173,745,000	114,848,000
1982	180,000,000	0	180,000,000
1983	335,100,000	110,619,000***	224,481,000
1984	255,900,000	72,919,000	182,981,000
1985	256,800,000	71,853,000	184,947,000
TOTALS	$ 6,289,858,598	$ 2,986,384,056	$ 3,303,474,542

* Includes some Federal administration costs for Federal Land Acquisition and State Grants; since 1980, also includes grants for New Jersey Pinelands National Reserve.

** Transition quarter, July 1, 1976, to September 30, 1976, because of adoption of new fiscal year calendar

*** Regular appropriation -- $70,619,000, plus $40,000,000 in FY 83 Supplement 1 funding (Emergency Jobs Bill)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BLANK PAGE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

REPORTING THRU SEPT 30, 1984

TABLE 2: STATE SUMMARY BY PROJECT TYPE

STATE	PLANNING COUNT	PLANNING OBLIGATIONS	##ACQUISITION COUNT	##ACQUISITION OBLIGATIONS	#DEVELOPMENT COUNT	#DEVELOPMENT OBLIGATIONS	#REDEVELOPMENT COUNT	#REDEVELOPMENT OBLIGATIONS	##COMB COUNT	ALL PROJECT TYPES COUNT	ALL PROJECT TYPES OBLIGATIONS	ALL PROJECT TYPES ACRES
ALABAMA	8	733,432.34	45	4,775,265.98	327	40,548,662.94	10	755647.37	106	496	46,813,008.63	9688.1
ALASKA	4	512,763.44	43	10,390,291.32	127	13,349,487.73	6	577075.52	18	198	24,829,618.01	26068.9
ARIZONA	7	431,289.87	59	8,675,871.12	477	31,860,293.04	8	270626.09	35	586	41,238,080.03	3464.8
ARKANSAS	11	777,384.43	70	6,834,435.47	344	28,245,709.85	6	375653.93	79	510	36,233,183.68	34680.7
CALIFORNIA	14	2723,830.57	299	107,619,797.93	604	91,802,086.37	44	3511342.04	7	968	205,657,056.91	163482.8
COLORADO	14	454,107.82	152	18,715,494.88	631	23,270,338.86	2	102300.08	28	827	42,542,241.54	57966.6
CONNECTICU	7	535,202.42	188	24,320,516.13	89	17,701,618.34	29	4815658.05	3	316	47,372,994.94	26192.0
DELAWARE	5	460,794.21	75	15,569,043.42	72	10,040,335.59	6	268822.52	10	168	26,338,995.74	16703.8
DIST. OF JL.	7	617,458.79	3	1,148,335.80	46	8,911,012.29	10	1816772.00	0	66	12,493,578.88	222.0
FLORIDA	0	.00	98	58,743,890.33	100	27,979,638.64	5	973854.76	4	199	87,697,383.73	68221.1
GEORGIA	14	943,886.90	91	23,550,744.04	473	32,470,443.39	19	1366059.86	96	693	58,331,134.19	90877.2
HAWAII	5	437,367.19	21	14,825,456.40	74	12,565,944.22	1	46914.50	3	104	27,875,682.38	244.9
IDAHO	6	561,504.87	44	5,319,151.10	241	22,468,980.76	8	238696.47	45	344	28,588,332.40	22159.6
ILLINOIS	8	1385,415.01	371	83,835,651.85	259	31,774,876.53	54	3595376.80	23	715	120,590,520.19	56264.9
INDIANA	8	517,879.56	64	14,616,245.46	252	46,488,930.23	32	1328564.03	89	426	62,951,619.28	27415.5
IOWA	6	315,376.47	258	14,459,358.98	682	24,664,690.35	21	950645.60	70	1037	40,390,071.40	50008.2
KANSAS	5	105,114.38	68	5,239,478.16	376	30,450,503.20	18	1802057.88	37	504	37,597,153.54	8884.1
KENTUCKY	8	422,915.69	67	9,678,391.04	517	32,507,892.65	25	933879.74	134	751	43,543,079.12	16495.7
LOUISIANA	8	327,295.53	94	14,843,044.87	338	37,889,659.46	12	863215.58	64	516	53,923,215.44	73244.0
MAINE	14	395,779.10	128	8,967,887.70	338	17,413,299.50	33	1916718.27	67	580	28,692,884.57	41832.0
MARYLAND	4	740,484.76	102	33,327,499.67	185	21,163,310.69			7	298	55,231,295.12	38516.1
MASSACHUSETTS	6	1037,474.22	75	24,187,836.06	169	38,481,261.51	48	9829854.15	27	325	73,455,625.94	21929.8
MICHIGAN	4	1415,252.91	386	36,930,623.79	995	56,896,344.47	23	918018.43	65	1393	96,160,239.60	69868.5
MINNESOTA	9	1022,615.30	393	27,491,389.15	598	24,037,936.65	22	621763.00	84	1106	53,173,704.10	88337.2
MISSISSIPPI	10	626,934.14	28	3,956,257.53	262	29,423,012.81	5	198887.10	49	354	34,205,091.58	21178.0
MISSOURI	8	590,828.31	336	28,157,986.05	459	34,056,150.78	12	1259135.66	132	947	64,064,108.80	55375.1
MONTANA	6	536,430.44	97	8,055,096.50	442	19,582,975.17	13	180606.44	63	621	28,355,108.55	558305.1
NEBRASKA	3	68,466.26	70	6,126,835.85	463	25,175,815.68	55	2216692.04	88	679	33,587,009.83	26972.4
NEVADA	8	709,623.62	25	8,612,564.06	164	18,020,580.68	10	492544.86	5	212	27,835,313.22	17122.3
NEW HAMPHSIRE	6	549,023.71	153	9,721,314.53	245	15,455,707.54	24	819706.87	36	464	26,545,752.65	44851.7
NEW JERSEY	2	532,500.00	41	30,813,022.18	231	59,700,932.40	2	1039271.66	1	277	92,085,726.24	61513.1
NEW MEXICO	17	1152,911.61	21	4,688,057.51	676	24,429,458.75	9	113952.48	53	776	30,384,380.35	14702.9
NEW YORK	9	4560,277.01	105	24,969,409.16	663	117,250,568.64	201	34985751.37	29	1007	181,766,006.18	65977.5

A PROJECT WITH NEW DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT TYPES IS TREATED AS A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.

A COMB. PROJECT AMOUNT IS DIVIDED BETWEEN ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT AMOUNTS, AS APPROPRIATE, BUT COUNTED AS A COMB. PROJ.

A PROJECT WITH MULTIPLE PROJECT TYPES, WHICH ALSO INCLUDES ACQUISITION TYPE, IS TREATED AS A COMBINATION PROJECT.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPORTING THRU SEPT 30, 1984

*** TABLE 2: STATE SUMMARY BY PROJECT TYPE ***

STATE	PLANNING COUNT	PLANNING OBLIGATIONS$	**ACQUISITION COUNT	**ACQUISITION OBLIGATIONS$	*DEVELOPMENT COUNT	*DEVELOPMENT OBLIGATIONS$	*REDEVELOPMENT COUNT	*REDEVELOPMENT OBLIGATIONS$	**COMB COUNT	ALL PROJECT TYPES COUNT	ALL PROJECT TYPES OBLIGATIONS$	ALL PROJECT TYPES ACRES
NORTH CAROLINA	13	1441,859.88	98	19,371,208.98	407	33,620,738.13	22	662698.60	160	700	55,096,505.59	35163.5
NORTH DAKOTA	10	421,526.99	63	2,992,766.07	690	21,813,055.73	16	687698.52	117	896	25,835,047.31	32878.3
OHIO	6	1088,184.85	337	46,700,520.50	466	63,400,242.09	9	1335195.01	71	889	112,524,142.45	44237.0
OKLAHOMA	7	867,613.33	61	6,682,779.84	648	32,898,120.19	11	668144.44	73	800	41,116,657.80	5067.1
OREGON	7	594,017.91	192	19,754,302.68	827	20,263,052.99	59	2902653.94	24	1109	43,514,027.52	23174.1
PENNSYLVANIA	6	1761,546.87	233	22,017,629.81	801	94,307,408.21	128	9890224.39	19	1187	127,976,808.48	90167.0
RHODE ISLAND	5	391,868.42	74	7,681,817.33	171	18,404,048.19	9	2424894.41	11	270	28,902,628.35	76257.2
SOUTH CAROLINA	13	905,632.59	81	14,516,347.22	707	26,158,365.52	25	574997.73	121	947	42,155,343.06	59288.8
SOUTH DAKOTA	9	329,913.40	63	2,784,024.81	835	23,160,079.43	71	1496229.23	71	1049	27,770,246.87	31081.8
TENNESSEE	8	746,292.41	84	14,211,095.61	295	35,182,722.27	34	3419484.07	63	484	53,559,594.36	41676.5
TEXAS	2	1118,483.98	98	32,559,580.59	567	88,790,951.62	4	361313.41	170	841	122,830,329.60	28756.6
UTAH	4	132,202.57	76	12,168,999.00	233	22,836,309.84	4	124100.00	20	337	35,261,611.41	27353.8
VERMONT	9	348,685.38	120	9,478,802.68	226	12,932,336.62	39	1841514.08	29	423	24,601,338.76	65162.7
VIRGINIA	3	119,461.09	55	30,573,985.70	143	29,203,656.44	2	267015.00	57	260	60,164,118.23	67020.7
WASHINGTON	6	552,326.93	190	23,533,208.67	235	24,777,524.88	27	2016021.78	7	465	50,879,082.26	132708.6
WEST VIRGINIA	2	61,941.22	35	3,824,849.81	206	29,092,845.15	9	948653.47	39	291	33,128,289.65	8798.8
WISCONSIN	6	193,628.88	684	30,451,440.52	842	25,166,737.79	32	1181982.14	38	1602	56,993,709.33	132000.1
WYOMING	10	789,243.04	11	1,340,201.49	535	21,858,015.13	14	887493.76	39	609	24,874,953.42	6666.2
AMERICAN SAMOA	2	33,451.00	0	75,684.00	19	655,291.43	2	41730.00	2	25	806,156.43	11.0
GUAM	3	69,731.00	1	79,000.00	11	1,117,944.73	2	93808.00	1	18	1,360,483.73	8.0
NO. MARIANAS	1	4,073.00	0	.00	0	.00			0	1	4,073.00	.0
PUERTO RICO	3	214,261.27	9	1,708,886.00	69	26,916,079.32	2	796862.00	8	91	29,636,088.59	684.3
VIRGIN ISLANDS	3	116,049.49	7	253,740.25	7	685,904.97	3	380400.00	0	20	1,436,094.71	43.0
**GRAND TOTAL*	389	38503,615.58	6554	1088,245,513.98	20859	1719,318,290.45	1278	112109098.88	2697	31777	2,870,176,518.89	2786171.8

* A PROJECT WITH NEW DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT TYPES IS TREATED AS A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.

** A COMB. PROJECT AMOUNT IS DIVIDED BETWEEN ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT AMOUNTS, AS APPROPRIATE, BUT COUNTED AS A COMB. PROJ.

** A PROJECT WITH MULTIPLE PROJECT TYPES, WHICH ALSO INCLUDES ACQUISITION TYPE, IS TREATED AS A COMBINATION PROJECT.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND TABLE 3
ASSISTANCE TO STATES
PERCENT OF FUNDS OBLIGATED IN FY 1984

STATE	TO LOCAL PROJECTS	IN SMSAs	FOR ACQUISITION
Alabama	78.54	51.57	19.38
Alaska	30.02	69.98	0.0
Arizona	100.00	56.88	8.57
Arkansas	83.97	19.74	24.75
California	51.02	89.07	31.40
Colorado	89.19	67.97	14.02
Connecticut	51.61	91.87	30.50
Delaware	36.22	50.87	12.35
Florida	100.00	88.00	4.27
Georgia	18.36	7.47	83.81
Hawaii	58.30	100.00	0.0
Idaho	82.64	0.0	0.0
Illinois	95.26	84.53	28.37
Indiana	74.40	48.04	41.69
Iowa	77.57	28.49	10.56
Kansas	44.59	33.65	0.53
Kentucky	91.17	23.49	21.82
Louisiana	85.84	49.95	7.15
Maine	84.59	29.36	7.58
Maryland	0.0	40.96	93.39
Massachusetts	97.95	89.81	0.0
Michigan	77.13	68.22	5.23
Minnesota	47.00	46.31	58.28
Mississippi	84.68	21.45	8.08
Missouri	75.01	47.73	63.87
Montana	100.00	0.0	0.0
Nebraska	78.25	47.17	61.55
Nevada	65.22	23.76	8.43
New Hampshire	58.57	35.83	17.32
New Jersey	24.53	71.70	75.47
New Mexico	94.59	21.74	3.25
New York	30.29	80.39	0.16
North Carolina	65.37	38.89	46.95
North Dakota	48.60	0.0	33.15
Ohio	96.86	81.44	57.11
Oklahoma	43.26	24.25	0.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND TABLE 3

ASSISTANCE TO STATES

PERCENT OF FUNDS OBLIGATED IN FY 1984

STATE	TO LOCAL PROJECTS	IN SMSAs	FOR ACQUISITION
Oregon	64.39	25.06	60.55
Pennsylvania	55.95	44.54	14.91
Rhode Island	31.08	100.00	68.92
South Carolina	69.52	26.19	27.23
South Dakota	52.07	11.06	0.54
Tennessee	80.93	58.67	9.86
Texas	100.00	49.04	54.59
Utah	100.00	50.66	0.0
Vermont	45.82	0.0	21.84
Virginia	51.83	56.79	32.16
Washington	58.76	49.54	38.37
West Virginia	43.28	37.12	2.02
Wisconsin	70.35	32.91	63.49
Wyoming	86.59	0.0	0.0
District of Col.	17.09	19.94	0.0
Puerto Rico	0.0	0.0	0.0
Virgin Islands	0.0	0.0	0.0
Guam	0.0	0.0	0.0
American Samoa	0.0	0.0	0.0
No. Marianas	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	63.45	51.14	31.43

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4

STATE	UNOBLIGATED BALANCE 9/30/83 2/	TOTAL AVAILABLE FY 1984 3/	UNOBLIGATED BALANCE 9/30/84 2/	PERCENT UNOBLIGATED
Alabama	$ 1,261,465	$ 1,625,215	$ 369,945	22.76
Alaska	511,222	1,287,521	654,068	50.8
Arizona	663	1,090,946	58	0.0
Arkansas	31,494	923,509	11,251	1.2
California	2,012,963	7,398,219	1,755,014	23.7
Colorado	40,474	1,250,356	107,096	8.6
Connecticut	3,362	1,263,320	49,670	3.9
Delaware	314,975	692,677	12,683	1.8
Florida	2,497,247	2,578,507	0	0.0
Georgia	996,828	2,302,634	783,723	34.0
Hawaii	555,497	1,619,503	858,778	53.0
Idaho	178,588	1,000,042	310,578	31.1
Illinois	578,437	3,131,267	299,407	9.6
Indiana	698,709	2,003,611	417,028	20.8
Iowa	31,400	1,439,251	430,195	29.9
Kansas	147,843	1,009,950	64,817	6.4
Kentucky	1,322,829	1,503,435	363,374	24.2
Louisiana	92,467	1,319,814	2,402	.2
Maine	1,085,230	731,490	231	0.0
Maryland	1	1,468,291	23,166	1.6
Massachusetts	254,660	1,752,188	15,970	.9
Michigan	2,892,163	5,093,108	2,669,691	52.4
Minnesota	152,681	1,528,838	228,435	14.9
Mississippi	585,395	993,826	81,983	8.2
Missouri	1,407,277	2,117,643	662,787	31.3
Montana	52,050	742,594	67,498	9.1
Nebraska	399,424	852,350	37,416	4.4
Nevada	0	765,090	34,038	4.4
New Hampshire	6,047	1,301,403	579,934	44.6
New Jersey	1,552,661	2,513,452	393,995	15.7
New Mexico	188,947	771,770	1,360	.2
New York	1,491	4,243,369	8,041	.2
North Carolina	1,600,515	2,017,820	477,638	23.7
North Dakota	92,573	707,438	40,809	5.8
Ohio	2,572,276	3,060,629	360,814	11.8
Oklahoma	558,578	1,109,593	18,517	1.7
Oregon	307,867	1,393,104	349,857	25.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4

STATE	UNOBLIGATED BALANCE 9/30/83 2/	TOTAL AVAILABLE FY 1984 3/	UNOBLIGATED BALANCE 9/30/84 2/	PERCENT UNOBLIGATED
Pennsylvania	935	3,089,423	156,010	5.0
Rhode Island	332,862	1,414,708	642,898	45.4
South Carolina	881,498	1,264,905	153,307	12.1
South Dakota	137,682	827,572	171,710	20.7
Tennessee	655,959	1,392,034	9,180	.7
Texas	1,456,740	3,924,966	552,586	14.1
Utah	0	857,704	0	0.0
Vermont	379,082	640,643	2,657	.4
Virginia	1,845	1,596,339	37,600	2.4
Washington	672,340	1,749,453	362,879	20.7
West Virginia	639,817	861,745	4,239	.5
Wisconsin	1,322,499	1,452,453	27,215	1.9
Wyoming	126,428	761,479	132,627	17.4
District of Col.	125	229,700	14	0.0
Puerto Rico	584,998	986,390	1	0.0
Virgin Islands	25,496	142,190	118,955	83.7
Guam	1	25,723	1	0.0
American Samoa	20,379	7,874	0	0.0
N. MARIANAS		4,073	0	0.0
TOTALS 1/	$ 32,224,989	$ 87,833,147	$ 14,914,146	16.98

1/ Totals may not add due to rounding.

2/ Does not include unobligated and unapportioned monies in the Contingency Reserve and the Special Reapportionment Account.

3/ Includes regular FY 1984 Apportionment and carryover funds from previous years.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

L&WCF GRANTS REQUESTED AND AWARDED - FISCAL YEAR 1984 TABLE 5

STATE	NO. OF GRANTS REQUESTED IN FY 84	* $ REQUESTED IN FY 1984	NO. OF GRANTS AWARDED IN FY 84	$ AWARDED IN FY 1984
Alabama	107	4,303,500	32	1,201,000
Alaska	22	2,304,533	7	633,453
Arizona	48	3,626,154	16	1,099,940
Arkansas	42	1,076,463	41	1,029,001
California	136	17,358,894	51	6,620,265
Colorado	61	5,679,123	12	803,288
Connecticut	40	6,044,747	12	1,552,262
Delaware	22	1,200,000	22	890,475
Florida	28	6,192,418	25	5,075,754
Georgia	138	6,050,614	48	1,574,500
Hawaii	2	463,840	2	463,840
Idaho	33	2,273,100	11	1,013,350
Illinois	62	8,800,000	18	2,831,860
Indiana	74	3,732,520	20	1,586,583
Iowa	61	1,406,128	26	1,009,056
Kansas	28	2,302,619	11	945,133
Kentucky	129	3,543,766	42	927,440
Louisiana	101	14,200,000	49	1,626,483
Maine	23	2,096,351	23	2,096,351
Maryland	15	9,675,039	8	1,674,951
Massachusetts	39	4,323,552	18	2,294,440
Michigan	277	18,148,928	40	2,423,417
Minnesota	261	8,956,525	28	1,300,403
Mississippi	71	3,569,193	35	1,305,486
Missouri	109	3,600,000	34	1,454,856
Montana	40	986,110	28	743,321
Nebraska	75	1,850,000	38	814,934
Nevada	37	2,660,197	15	705,251
New Hampshire	43	908,350	24	849,592
New Jersey	193	113,200,000	3	2,650,000
New Mexico	117	4,500,000	55	1,095,765
New York	206	33,700,000	23	5,702,321
North Carolina	82	3,064,643	38	1,898,319
North Dakota	101	3,590,433	20	815,861
Ohio	132	15,292,723	27	2,699,815
Oklahoma	89	2,660,275	86	1,927,410
Oregon	73	2,320,600	49	1,274,500

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

L&WCF GRANTS REQUESTED AND AWARDED - FISCAL YEAR 1984 TABLE 5

STATE	NO. OF GRANTS REQUESTED IN FY 84	* $ REQUESTED IN FY 1984	NO. OF GRANTS AWARDED IN FY 84	$ AWARDED IN FY 1984
Pennsylvania	333	19,963,119	66	3,502,788
Rhode Island	57	3,945,923	5	604,569
South Carolina	74	2,508,720	72	2,161,110
South Dakota	72	804,619	45	644,919
Tennessee	133	6,330,000	38	1,921,660
Texas	88	12,874,265	35	4,286,846
Utah	43	4,077,664	11	891,796
Vermont	40	2,033,164	39	1,755,559
Virginia	31	3,656,375	13	2,421,195
Washington	45	4,645,440	26	1,079,615
West Virginia	42	2,718,853	26	2,180,800
Wisconsin	168	6,606,009	29	1,425,238
Wyoming	48	2,085,241	33	643,789
District of Col.	6	500,000	4	175,569
Puerto Rico	15	2,885,478	6	2,182,228
Virgin Islands	2	51,163	1	6,000
Guam	1	26,214	1	26,214
American Samoa	3	52,720	3	52,720
N. MARIANAS	1	4,073	1	4,073
TOTAL	4,319	$ 401,430,378	1,491	$ 90,577,364

* NOTE: Many States negotiate the amounts requested by State & local applicants, based upon the amount of total funding available or place dollar limits on the amounts that can be requested. Therefore, these data do not necessarily indicate all "demand" for grants in a given fiscal year.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1985 527 165 20426

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

END

1-29-86